



Subject: Potential Electric Reliability Risks Due to Cessation of Power Generation as a Result of the Closure Unlined Surface Impoundments Under 40 CFR Part 257.101 for the Failure to Meet Groundwater Protection Standards

EPA Docket ID: EPA-HQ-OLEM-2016-0274

Hazardous and Solid Waste Management System: Disposal of Coal Combustion Residuals from

Electric Utilities; Extension of Compliance Deadlines for Certain Inactive Surface

Impoundments; Response to Partial Vacatur

Summary of EEI Findings

As part of an internal EEI review to assess the potential impacts on electric reliability due to the possible inability of affected resource owners to sufficiently remediate certain coal combustion residuals (CCR) surface impoundments by the dates set forth in the above reference EPA Final Rule, EEI developed the following high level evaluation of the reliability impacts associated with forcing affected coal fired resources into a "Forced Outage" mode. While the term Forced Outage is more typically used to describe a generating unit, transmission line or other facility that is out of service due to an equipment failure, the impact of a forced outage due to an entity's inability to meet the EPA deadline would result in the same effect as an actual equipment failure since the resource would be unavailable for service.

Those reviewing the EEI findings should recognize that our findings were not part of any detailed planning study and provide a very high level review of <u>possible</u> worst case impacts on a regional level. Moreover, those reviewing our high level findings should consider the following:

- 1. This review only considered a worst case scenario due to the closure of unlined CCR impoundments not meeting groundwater protection standards. (i.e., all affected resources would be in a Forced Outage mode due to not meeting the compliance date for mitigating their CCR obligations).
- 2. When assessing the impact of CCR related outages, EEI utilized the published Anticipated Reserve Margin since this includes operable capacity expected to be available to serve load with firm transmission along with Tier 1 capacity and Firm Capacity Transfers.
- 3. No effort was made to consider the impact of "Prospective Reserves", which broadly represent the inclusion of operable capacity that may lack firm transmission, Tier 2 capacity additions and nonfarm Capacity Transfers (imports minus exports) without firm contracts.

¹ NERC Glossary of Terms; Forced Outage: 1. The removal from service availability of a generating unit, transmission line, or other facility for emergency reasons. 2. The condition in which the equipment is unavailable due to unanticipated failure.

- 4. Reserve Margin impacts were only considered during "On Peak" periods.
- 5. In the context of this review, it is considered that in order to maintain Reliable Operation³ of the BES, the Anticipated Reserve Margin ⁴ as defined in sessional reliability assessments developed by NERC are to held be at or above the published Reference Reserve Margin⁵.
- 6. For purposes of this review, EEI used data from the NERC 2017 Summer Reliability Assessment⁶. No effort was done to consider similar impacts during winter months which may be more or less severe by region.
- 7. EEI recognizes that the likelihood of <u>all</u> CCR impacted resources not meeting the EPA imposed compliance deadline is highly unlikely.
- 8. EEI does not have sufficient insights to accurately predict the resource mix by fuel type beyond what has been provided in the NERC 2017 Summer Reliability Assessment.
- 9. The contribution of Coal Fired resources as considered in this review is as indicated in the NERC 2017 Summer Reliability Assessment and as identified as "On-Peak Expected Capacity: Generation Mix".

EEI Findings:

Assessment	Potential Reliability Impact (during "On-Peak" periods)						
ERCOT	Loss of Impacted CCR Coal Resources could result in the anticipated summer reserve margin for ERCOT dropping below the level identified as necessary to maintain regional reliability.						
FRCC	Loss of Impacted CCR Coal Resources appears to be insufficient to affect regional reliability.						
MISO	MISO is highly dependent on coal resources. The apparent affect resulting from the loss of CCR Resources could have significant impacts within this region, which could necessitate MISO to shed load, rely on imports or both in order meet their peak load demands as well as require additional resource contracts to support reliability reserves.						
NPCC-Maritimes	No regional impacts						
NPCC-New	No regional impacts						
England							

² NERC Glossary of Terms; On-Peak: Those hours or other periods defined by NAESB business practices, contract, agreements, or guides as periods of higher electrical demand.

 $\frac{http://www.nerc.com/pa/RAPA/ra/Reliability\%20Assessments\%20DL/2017\%20Summer\%20Assessment.pdf$

³ NERC Glossary of Terms; Reliable Operation: Operating the elements of the [Bulk-Power System] within equipment and electric system thermal, voltage, and stability limits so that instability, uncontrolled separation, or cascading failures of such system will not occur as a result of a sudden disturbance, including a cybersecurity incident, or unanticipated failure of system elements.

⁴ Anticipated reserve margin is quantify of resource reserves that has been identified through a detailed planning assessments which can be expected to support BES reliability in the event of an unanticipated failure of a system element. (See NERC Reliability Standard: TPL-001-4)

⁵ The reference reserve margin is the reserve margin that has been identified by the regional planner as necessary to ensure Reliable Operation.

NPCC-New York	No regional impacts
PJM	Loss of Impacted CCR Coal Resources would result in the anticipated summer reserve
	margin for PJM dropping below the level identified as necessary to maintain regional reliability.
SERC	SERC is highly dependent on coal resources. The impact resulting from the loss of CCR
	Resources would be significant potentially requiring SERC to shed load, rely on
	imports or both in order meet their peak load requirements and reliability reserves.
SPP	Loss of Impacted CCR Coal Resources would result in the anticipated summer reserve
	margin for SPP dropping below the level identified as necessary to maintain regional
	reliability.
WECC	Loss of impacted CCR coal reserves would have marginal impacts on WECC reliability.
	While the loss of these reserves would cause WECC to fall below the reference
	reserve level, it would only fall slightly below that level.

		Nameplate	: Capacity (MW)		1						
NERC Assessment Area and State	All Generating Units		All Generating		On-Peak Expected Capacity Of Coal by Region (NERC Summer Reliability Assessment)	Percent of Coal Fired Generating Capacity at Risk due to Unlined Surface Impoundments	Estimated Reserve Impact	2017 Summer Reference Margin Level	2017 Summer Anticipated Reserve Margin	Potential Reserve Margin due to CCR Forced Outages	Notes
ASCC Alaska	3,209 3,209	164 164	81 81	81 81	3% 3%	50% 50%	1% 1%		NA	NA	
								43.70%	in any		Loss of impacted CCR Resources could result in having
Texas	114,149 114,149	21,177 21,177	7,469 7,469	7,470 7,470	25% 25%	35% 35%	9% 9%	13.75%	18.90%		inadequate reserves during peak periods.
FRCC Florida	66,818 66,818	10,010 10,010	6,162 6,162	5,855 5,855	9% 9%	58% 58%	5% 5%	15.00%			No impact
HCC Hawaii	3,146 3,146	203 203	0	0	0% 0%	0% 0%	9% 0%		NA	NA	
											MISO is highly dependent of coal resources. The loss of impacted CCR Resources could have substantial impacts during
MISO Arkansas	198,989 12,489	72,230 4,320	46,419 0	41,321	43% 0%	57% 0%	25%	15.80%	18.77%		peak periods.
Illinois Indiana	18,722 21,217	9,686 13,747	7,684 11,989	6,801 10,231	41% 57%	70% 74%	29% 42%				
Iowa	18,144	6,325	4,240	4,161	23%	66%	15%				
Kentucky Louisiana	2,650 27,758	2,255 4,207	781 721	682 721	29% 3%	30% 17%	9% 0%				
Michigan Minnesota	30,162 18,134	10,704 4,835	7,548 3,542	5,821 3,542	25% 20%	54% 73%	14% 14%				
Mississippi Missouri	7,935 9,804	400 5,430	400 5,772	5,378	5% 59%	100% 99%	5% 58%				
Montana North Dakota	241 4,897	54 1,894	0 450	0 450	0% 9%	0% 24%	0% 2%				
South Dakota Texas	1,162 6,624	456 0	356 0	355 0	31% 0%	78% 0%	24% 0%				
Wisconsin NPCC-Maritimes	19,050 323	7,917 0	2,936 0	2,779	15%	35% 0%	5% 0%	20.00%	90.99%		No impacted accurac
Maine	323	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%				No impacted resources
NPCC-New England Connecticut	36,225 9,816	965 400	0	0 0	0% 0%	0% 0%	0% 0%	15.10%	14.88%	14.9%	No impacted resources
Maine Massachusetts	5,000 13,675	0 6	0	0	0% 0%	0% 0%	0% 0%				
New Hampshire Rhode Island	4,797 2,124	559 0	0	0 0	0% 0%	0% 0%	0% 0%				
Vermont NPCC-New York	814 44,191	0 1,738	0	0 0	0% 0%	0% 0%	0% 0%	18.00%	28 5.4%		No impacted resources
New York	44,191	1,738	0	0	0%	0%	0%	18.0078	25.34/8		
PIM	213,685	65,046	45,563	43,556	33%	67%	22%	16.60%	28.4%	6.3%	Loss of impacted CCR Resources could result in having inadequate reserves during peak periods.
Delaware District of Columbia	3,543 25	446 0	0	0	0% 0%	0% 0%	0% 0%				
Illinois Indiana	32,838 7,450	4,437 3,960	2,288 3,904	1,917 3,904	7% 52%	43% 99%	3% 52%				
Kentucky Maryland	5,302 14,736	2,622 5,127	2,549 0	2,278 0	48% 0%	87% 0%	42% 0%				
Michigan New Jersey	2,469 19,887	0 691	0	0	0% 0%	0% 0%	0% 0%				
North Carolina Ohio	1,666 31,807	137 16,537	0 15,512	0 15,262	0% 49%	0% 92%	0% 45%				
Pennsylvania	49,249	14,139	10,788	10,391	22%	73% 60%	16%				
Virginia West Virginia	29,120 15,594	3,701 13,250	2,921 7,602	2,220 7,584	10% 49%	57%	6% 28%				
SERC - Combined	188.899	56,130	68,810	48,960	37%	87%	27.91%	15,00%	25.35%		SERC is highly dependent of coal resources. The loss of impacted CCR Resources could have substantial impacts during peak periods.
											SERC-E is highly dependent of coal resources. The loss of impacted CCR Resources could have substantial impacts during
SERC-E Georgia	57,645 18	16,156 0	19,551 0	14,921 0	32% 0%	92% 0%	29.55% 0%	15.00%	17.17%		peak periods.
North Carolina South Carolina	33,201 24,425	10,527 5,629	14,051 5,500	10,499 4,422	42% 23%	100% 79%	42% 18%				
											SERC-N is highly dependent of coal resources. The loss of impacted CCR Resources could have substantial impacts during
SERC-N Alabama	59,565 7,175	20,708 0	22,753 476	16,282	32% 7%	79%	25.16% 0%	15.00%	22.01%		peak periods.
Arkansas	679	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%				
Georgia Kentucky	47 15,820	9, 44 6	12,730	9,445	0% 80%	0% 100%	0% 80%				
Mississippi Missouri	5,443 4,309	514 2,482	2,482	0 2,482	0% 58%	0% 100%	0% 58%				
North Carolina Oklahoma	688 1,066	53 0	0	0	0% 0%	0% 0%	0% 0%				
Tennessee Virginia	24,336 4	8,215 0	7,065 0	4,355 0	29% 0%	53% 0%	15% 0%				
SERC-SE	71,689	19,265	26,506 10,040	17,757	32% 41%	92% 97%	29.50% 40%	15.00%	36.35%	6.9%	Loss of impacted CCR Resources could result in having inadequate reserves during peak periods.
Alabama Florida	24,619 2,376	6,745 1,135	662	6,562	28%	0%	0%				
Georgia Mississippi	40,325 4,370	10,289 1,097	12,575 2,229	10,098 1,097	31% 51%	98% 100%	31% 51%				
SPP Arkansas	90,560 3,231	26,561 1,167	10,577 558	9,402 558	38% 17%	35% 48%	13% 8%	12%	26.60%		No impact
Iowa Kansas	918 17,210	0 5,235	0 3,820	0 3,820	0% 22%	0% 73%	0% 16%				
Louisiana Minnesota	1,002 165	0	0	0	0% 0%	0% 0%	0% 0%				
Missouri Montana	9,658	4,498 0	1,374	1,374	14%	31% 0%	4% 0%				
Nebraska New Mexico	8,999 2,272	3,983	324 0	324 0	4% 0%	8% 0%	0% 0%				
PAGA INCYICO	4,414	U	0		1 0%	U%	U70				1

ļ											
NERC Assessment Area and State	All Generating Units	All Coal-Fired Generating Units	All Generating Units at Plants with Unlined Surface Impoundments (MW)		Expected Capacity Of Coal by Region (NERC Summer Reliability	Percent of Coal Fired Generating Capacity at Risk due to Unlined Surface Impoundments	Estimated Reserve Impact	2017 Summer Reference Margin Level	2017 Summer Anticipated Reserve Margin	Potential Reserve Margin due to CCR Forced Outages	Notes
North Dakota	3,670	2,279	0	0	0%	0%	0%				
Oklahoma	26,633	4,777	2,094	919	8%	19%	2%				
South Dakota	3,120	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%				
Texas	12,890	4,053	1,837	1,837	14%	45%	6%				
Wyoming	570	570	570	570	100%	100%	100%				
											Loss of impacted CCR Resources could result in relatively minor impacts, but nevertheless inadequate reserves during peak
WECC-Combined	249,030	12,199	15 034	13,462	18%	43%	236	15 40%	22.10%		periods.
WECCCAMX-US	84,675	131	0	0	**************************************	0%	0%	16.14%	18.71%	18.71%	No impact
California	84,672	131	0	0	0%	0%	0%				
Nevada	3	0	0	0		0%	0%				
WECCNWPP	86,405	13,474	5,297	5,297	18%	39%	7%	16.56%	23.03%	16.0%	No impact
California	113	0	0	0	0%	0%	0%				
Idaho	5,305	19	0	0	0%	0%	0%				
Montana	5,907	2,518	2,272	2,272	38%	90%	35%				
Nevada	13,213	809	0	0	0%	0%	0%				
Oregon	17,393	642	0	0	0%	0%	0%				
Utah	9,602	4,930	0	0	0%	0%	0%				
Washington	31,351	1,460	0	0	0%	0%	0%				
Wyoming	3,520	3,096	3,025	3,025	86%	98%	84%				
WECCRMRG	23,060	8,625	5,685	4,459	18%	52%	9%	14.17%	27.41%	18.10%	No impact
Colorado	18,025	5,535	3,728	2,502	21%	45%	9%				
South Dakota	145 4.890	3.090	1.957	1,957	40%	0% 63%	0% 25%				
Wyoming WECCSRSG	4,890	3,090 9,970	1,957 4,052	1,957 3,706	18%	37%	25% 7%	15.83%	28.82%	99-2007	No impact
Arizona	31,897	6.229	2,416	2.070	8%	33%	3%	13.65%	45.52%	££.170	NO III pact
New Mexico	7,485	3,741	1,636	1,636	22%	33% 44%	10%				
Texas	1,566	3,741	0	1,636	0%	0%	0%				
Grand Total	1,195,281	286,420	200,115	170.107	17%	59%	10%		NA	NA.	
Grand rotal	1,133,261	200,420	200,113	170,107	1/70	3976	10%		AN	NA	